

COPY



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARK  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/734,637	12/12/00	VOLGAS	HCC-9 (306*141)

EXAMINER
----------

LOVERING

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1712

5

DATE MAILED:

### INTERVIEW SUMMARY

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) MR. ASHLEY PEZNER (C) \_\_\_\_\_  
(2) MR. RICHARD D. LOVERING (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview AUG. 28, 2002

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Televideo Conference ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No If yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

Agreement ☐ was reached. ☒ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: 29, 36, 39, 42, 47, 49 & 51

Identification of prior art discussed: APPLIED ART IN GENERAL.

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: APPLICANT WILL AMEND

TO OVERCOME PRIOR ART REJECTIONS BY ADDING COMPONENT (C) AN OIL THICKENER WHICH IS SILICON  
BASED TO CLAIMS 29, 47 & 51, AND CANCEL CLAIMS 36, 39 & 49; (2) ADDING PROVIDE THAT THERE IS  
< 10% WATER TO CLAIMS 42, 47 & 51; APPLICANTS WILL AMEND TO OVERCOME 112, 2DP REJECTIONS  
AND WILL SUBMIT TERMINAL DISCLAIMER TO OBLVATE OBVIOUSNESS-TYPE DOUBLE PATENTING REJECTION.  
APPLICANTS WILL CANCEL CLAIMS TO NON-ELECTED INVENTION, AND AMEND TO CORRECT INVENTORSHIP OF  
(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable DELETING  
must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be ONE OF  
attached.) ORIGINAL  
CO-INVENTORS

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an attachment to another form.

703-308-0443

FORM PTOL-413 (REV. 2-98)

Richard D. Lovering  
RICHARD D. LOVERING  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
GROUP 1700

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/734,637	VOLGAS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Daniel S. Metzmaier	1712	

**All Participants:**

(1) Daniel S. Metzmaier.

(2) Richard M. Beck.

**Status of Application: \_\_\_\_\_**

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 6 April 2005

**Time:** ~ 11:0 AM

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

*rejection under 35 USC 112, second paragraph.*

Claims discussed:

*42, 52, and 56.*

Prior art documents discussed:

*none.*

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



DANIEL S. METZMAIER  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

ART UNIT 1712

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: examiner proposed amending claim 42 to define the composition in the preamble as a "concentrate" and to limit the water content to "less than 10% water". Examiner proposed explicitly setting forth the % as "by weight", which is the only % disclosed in the disclosure. Discussed the original claims 38 and 41 as basis for the water content limitation. Applicants' representative authorized said amendments by examiner's amendment and authorized charging the deposit account 03-2775 the required fee of \$120 for the One Month extension of time.